

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 JOHN DOE,
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 STATE OF CALIFORNIA ACTING BY
11 AND THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE,
12 Defendant.

Case No. 5:22-cv-08685-BLF

REMAND ORDER

13
14 On December 13, 2022, Defendants City of Sunnyvale and Officer John Bognanno filed a
15 Notice of Removal removing this action from the Superior Court of California for the County of
16 Santa Clara. ECF No. 1; *see Doe v. Dep't of Just. of the State of Cal. et al.*, No. 22-cv-405055
17 (Santa Clara Super. Ct.). On August 19, 2024, the Court identified a jurisdictional issue regarding
18 the pending case and issued an Order to Show Cause Why Case Should Not Be Remanded to State
19 Court. ECF No. 47. In their Joint Statement in response to the Order to Show Cause, which was
20 filed the following day, the Parties concurred that the matter should be remanded. ECF No. 48.
21 The Court therefore remands this case to the Superior Court of California for the County of Santa
22 Clara.

23 A district court may “decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over a claim” if it “has
24 dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction.” 28 U.S.C. § 1337(c)(3); *Arroyo v.*
25 *Rosas*, 19 F.4th 1202, 1210 (9th Cir. 2021). “[I]n the usual case in which all federal-law claims
26 are eliminated before trial, the balance of factors to be considered under the [*United Mine Workers*
27 *of Am. v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715 (1966),] doctrine—judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and
28 comity—will point toward declining to exercise jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims.”

1 *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 n.7 (1988).

2 Removal of this matter was based on federal-question jurisdiction. ECF No. 1 at 1–2.
3 Specifically, Plaintiff John Doe asserted claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendants City
4 of Sunnyvale and Officer John Bognanno. ECF No. 2 at 11. However, on August 17, 2023, the
5 Court approved a stipulation of dismissal with prejudice as to all causes of action against
6 Defendants City of Sunnyvale, Officer John Bognanno, and all Doe defendants alleged to be City
7 of Sunnyvale employees, contractors, or agents. ECF No. 35. Thus, all parties against which
8 Plaintiff asserted federal claims have now been dismissed. Nothing suggests that the instant
9 matter is any more than a usual case in which the *Gibbs* values point the Court toward declining to
10 exercise jurisdiction over the remaining state claims, and the Parties are in agreement that remand
11 of this matter is appropriate. ECF No. 48 at 1.

12 For the stated reasons, this case is hereby REMANDED to the Superior Court of California
13 for the County of Santa Clara.

14

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16

17 Dated: August 20, 2024

18

19 
BETH LABSON FREEMAN
United States District Judge

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28